

REMARKS

This is a complete response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed August 25, 2004. Claims 16-19 and 21-23 have been amended herein. No new matter has been added. Upon entry of the enclosed claim amendments, claims 16-27 remain pending in the present application.

The Applicant traverses all of the objections and rejections of the Office Action. Applicant presents aspects of the application that have been publicly known prior to filing of this application and aspects the Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's review of the above-identified patent application and respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

I. Response to claim objections

Applicant has amended claims 3, 5, 21, 23-27 to correct informalities as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of claim objections.

A. Claim 21-22

Applicant has amended claims 21-22 to correctly read "slots" in place of "lots" as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim objections.

B. Claim 16

Applicant has amended claim 16 to recite "said local area network" in place of "said area network" as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim objections.

Applicant has amended claim 16 to recite the four points of interfaces and associated quantities of the four points of interfaces. Applicant does not concede that the prior claim language was indefinite and indeed believes that the language was in fact quite clear. Applicant's prior claim language recites, "a first point of interface T designating a number of incoming trunks. . ." Applicant is claiming a first point of interface with an amount of trunks coupled to the first point of interface equal to "T". However, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended the claim language to read as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of

the claim objections.

C. Claims 16-27 regarding 112 first paragraph

The Examiner has withdrawn the previous objection based on the enablement of the disclosure with regard to the workings of a CCPRO switch and other switching devices. The Examiner asserts a new objection based on lack of disclosure for configuring the switching devices in the manner disclosed in Applicant's application. Examiner presently asserts that claims 16-27 and the specification fail to provide adequate disclosure to enable one skilled in the art to configure the switching devices as recited in claims 16-27.

Applicant's specification provides the various interfaces for connecting to the switching devices (page 5, lines 3-14 of Applicant's specification). Applicant's specification also provides the amount of connections for each interface. Applicant's invention provides a configuration and amount of connections to allow an individual to exchange and efficiently expand the system by adding additional switching devices. Applicant has provided various references validating the knowledge of one skilled in the art of switching devices.

In re: Jose Villena et al.
Filed: December 7, 1999
Serial No.: 09/456,166
Page 9

The Examiner is again reminded that the MPEP § 2163(A) states: "There is a strong presumption that an adequate written description of the claimed invention is present when the application is filed. *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 263, 191 USPQ 90, 97 (CCPA 1976) ('We are of the opinion that the PTO has the initial burden of presenting evidence or reasons why a person skilled in the art would not recognize any disclosure in a description of the invention defined by the claims.')."

The Examiner has not identified what aspect of the invention one skilled in the art would be unable to practice in view of the disclosure in Applicant's application. Applicant respectfully submits that the above-identified application describes the claimed invention in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art would reasonably conclude that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant further submits that the configuration of the interfaces is disclosed and would enable an individual of ordinary skill in the art of switching devices to practice Applicant's invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that the CCPRO and other switching devices are well-known products. In support of this, Applicant previously filed a Declaration under 37 CFR § 1.132 of

In re: Jose Villena et al.
Filed: December 7, 1999
Serial No.: 09/456,166
Page 10

Eyal Ben-Chanoch as well as an article released in June 1999 by Tern Systems. The article by Tern Systems describes a CCPRO switch and how it works. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the CCPRO and other switching devices are in the conventional art and are known to one of ordinary skill in the art. Applicant further submits that time division multiplexing of communication channels is also known in the art. The switching arrangement as disclosed by Applicant may be implemented using time division multiplexing (TDM) as disclosed in Applicant's specification. Based on Applicant's disclosure, it would be apparent that physical channels of communication might alternately be multiplexed channels within a physical channel. Therefore, the rejections of claim 16-27 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 1st paragraph, is improper. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim objections.

II. Response to claim rejections based on obviousness

In the Office Action, claims 16-19 and 24-27 have been preliminarily rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Specifically claims 16-19 and 24-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by U.S. Patent No. 6,157,665 to Shtivelman

(hereinafter, "Shtivelman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,005,920 to Fuller et al. (hereinafter, "Fuller").

A. Claim 16

Amended independent claim 1 reads:

A contact center comprising;
a local area network; and
a first and at least a second switching apparatus for connecting to at least one public network, said first and at least said second switching apparatus being configured to communicate over said local area network and arranged to communicate with each other over said local area network, wherein each switching apparatus includes:
a first point of interface T coupling a number of incoming trunks;
a second point of interface S coupling a number of agent stations;
a third point of interface R coupling a number of call processing resources; and
a fourth point of interface B coupling only a number of broadband connections reserved for connecting one switching apparatus to another, wherein the number of broadband connections is greater than or equal to the number of trunks + the number of agent stations.

(Emphasis Added)

The Applicant respectfully submits that the references Shtivelman in view of Fuller fail to disclose, teach, or suggest all elements of the rejected claim for at least the reasons that follow. Specifically, Shtivelman in view of Fuller fails to disclose the above-emphasized elements of claim 16. Shtivelman does not disclose or suggest connecting a switching device

(Element 69, Figure 2 of Shtivelman) to another switching device.

Fuller does not cure this defect. Fuller does disclose a computer telephony integration (CTI) server connected to another fault redundant CTI server. However, Fuller is connecting the two CTI servers to provide fault redundancy. The Examiner references the communication path termed the "heartbeat" path (Elements 162 and 165, Figure 2 of Fuller) as disclosing applicant's broadband connections reserved for connecting one switching apparatus to another. However, Fuller does not connect the switching devices as claimed and disclosed in Applicant's application. Fuller connects the two CTI servers to investigate the status of the active server and to permit the transfer of necessary information to affect a switchover, the activation of the standby server and deactivation of the active server (Page 5, Lines 60-65, of Fuller). Fuller does not teach or suggest adding an additional switch to provide increased capacity. Fuller's heartbeat path is not used to provide switching ability between switches as claimed and described in Applicant's specification. Further, Fuller does not disclose, teach, or suggest the number of broadband connections being greater than or equal to the number of trunks plus the number of agent stations. Fuller discloses zero

In re: Jose Villena et al.
Filed: December 7, 1999
Serial No.: 09/456,166
Page 13

broadband connections reserved for connecting one switching apparatus to another. Fuller's heartbeat path is not used to provide connection switching between the CTI servers. Therefore, Fuller's number of broadband connections cannot be greater than or equal to the number of trunks plus the number of agent stations. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejection.

B. Claims 17-27

The Applicant respectfully submits that since claims 17-27 depend on independent claim 16, claims 17-27 contain all limitations of independent claim 16. Since independent claim 16 should be allowed, as argued herein, pending dependent claims 17-27 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason.

In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1608 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

III. Prior Art Made of Record

The prior art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

In re: Jose Villena et al.
Filed: December 7, 1999
Serial No.: 09/456,166
Page 14

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and rejections have been traversed, rendered moot and/or accommodated, and that presently pending claims 16-27 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and the presently pending claims are hereby courteously requested. The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Jose Villena et al.

By Andrew R. Martin
Andrew R. Martin
Registration No. 45,413
Attorney for Applicant(s)

BOURQUE & ASSOCIATES, P.A.
835 Hanover Street, Suite 301
Manchester, New Hampshire 03104

Telephone: (603) 623-5111
Facsimile: (603) 624-1432

Date: 2-25-05